REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Within the Office Action, claims 31-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner contends that the claims "contain subject matter which is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention." Specifically, the Examiner alleges that "Independent claim 31 sets forth the limitations of "(2) contextual information indicating a type of data implicitly specified by the utterance" and "for each grammar that contains a user utterance having contextual information associated within, activating a further grammar based on the contextual information of a preceding grammar", which limitations involve new matter and/or are misdescriptive of the invention as originally disclosed.

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the specification, as originally filed, discloses support for the cited limitations.

The Applicant is currently amending claim 31 such that it becomes clearer to the Examiner that the claimed invention was originally disclosed at the time the application was filed. Based on this amendment and the remarks below, it will become clear that the specification discloses at least one example of a method using contextual information that is implicitly specified to chain further grammars. Page 12 of the specification includes an "Application Example" which correlates

to Figure 4. The Application Example teaches the chaining of grammars as claimed in claim 31.

The example teaches that:

> "[T]he grammar in Figure 4 does not specify what information the user wants to know about "Robert Redford". In this case, the application determines which action to take based on the application context and the results returned from the recognizer."

One of the contextual determinations, as illustrated in Figure 4, is "Actor Type". The specification goes on to explain that the "Recognizer passes "Robert Redford" and *Actor Type* to the Command Processor", "The Command Processor decides to get Robert Redford movies from a Data Source", and "A list of Robert Redford movies is displayed to the user."

The Examiner states that "it is certainly unclear what linked grammar would be activated by an implicit information type command". The utterance "Robert Redford" is one such command. Thus, the Applicant can provide clarity to the Examiner by pointing out that the specification further explains how the process continues after passing the implicitly specified contextual information to the Command Processor.

On Page 12, line 7, the Applicant clearly states that grammars can be linked "either explicitly or implicitly". Furthermore, as explained above, the process utilizes the Command Processor in the contextual determination example. At Page 10, lines 5-25 of the Specification, the Applicant also teaches that the "Command Processor 15 updates the current context" while the Context Manager "activate[s] the appropriate grammars for the current context".

Therefore, it is clear that a complete reading of the Applicant's disclosure would teach one having ordinary skill in the art a method in which a user provides an utterance, the recognizer returns contextual information about the utterance to the command processor which updates the current context.   Next, the specification teaches a context manager that activates further grammars based on the context.

In other words (using the language from the example above) the disclosure teaches a method of using "contextual information indicating a type of data implicitly specified by the utterance" (i.e. "Actor Type" specified by the utterance "Robert Redford") to "activate[e] a further grammar based on the contextual information of a preceding grammar" (i.e. the Context Manager activating a list of movies having Robert Redford as an actor once the Command Processor updates the current context based on the context, "Actor Type", of the utterance "Robert Redford").

Therefore it is easy to see that the Applicant has adequately disclosed a method including "(2) contextual information indicating a type of data implicitly specified by the utterance" and "for each grammar that contains a user utterance having contextual information associated within, determining which options to make available to user next, thus activating a further grammar based on the contextual information of a preceding grammar, wherein the further grammar at least partially includes the options."

For at least these reasons it is clear that the limitations of claim 31, as amended, are contained in the Applicant's original specification, filed October 30, 2003, and therefore are allowable.   Likewise, claims 32-37 are allowable for being non-obvious dependent claims depending on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully request examination and reconsideration in view of the amendments above and remarks above. Should the Examiner deem it helpful he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael Glenn, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Glenn
Registration No. 30,176

Customer No.: 22,862